

Date: Fri, 19 Nov 93 04:30:21 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #466  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 19 Nov 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    466

Today's Topics:

                                    No Code etc...  
                                    spread spectrum  
      THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas  
                                    This is a hobby not a  
                                    Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 18 Nov 93 16:30:48 GMT  
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: No Code etc...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <931117.70469.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com>  
writes:

> All the "code-free HF" proponents are saying is that the test should be  
> relevant to the privileges being granted; a Morse test is NOT relevant to the  
> use of other modes. The better way is with a stiffer written test, with heavy  
> emphasis on regulations and operating procedures.

While this is an excellent idea, and one which I think that many  
people would be willing to buy off on, there is one problem with it:  
historically, the amateur radio written tests have been "dumbed down"  
so more and more people can get into the hobby. Recent examples  
include rewriting the novice and tech question pools for a 12-year-old

reading comprehension level.

I would like to see a much easier licensing scheme:

Class: Privs: Requirements:

Class B: VHF/UHF Written exam, 85% or better required out  
of 100 questions. No code.

Class A: All Class B requirements plus 8wpm code test

However, I think that the written exam needs to be extremely beefed up, and administered similar to the SATs. No more "published" question pools - let the exam coordinator maintain the questions themselves based upon formulas - for instance, we all know the formula to obtain the resonant frequency of a circuit. Well, instead of having 5 questions on this material which can be easily memorized, we should have a generic formula which the computer then picks values for, along with several answers. Totally random, and people HAVE to know the formula and how it works to solve the problem.

Anyone want to write the petition with me?

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan  
-- Population Studies & Training Center  
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912  
-- (401) 863-7284

-----

Date: 18 Nov 93 19:11:17 GMT  
From: idacrd.ccr-p.ida.org!idacrd!n4hy@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: spread spectrum  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I would love the details on this. Surely it was FH spread and not DSS?  
How can one read about their implementations?

Bob

--

-----

Robert W. McGwier	n4hy@ccr-p.ida.org Interests: ham radio,
Center for Communications Research	scouts, astronomy, and golf
Princeton, N.J. 08520	ASM Troop 5700, ACM Pack 53 Hightstown

-----  
Date: 16 Nov 1993 14:23:13 GMT  
From: drit@athena.mit.edu  
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <mXq1cc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

- > Test? How? Can you pass a packet test by ear - at any speed?
- > Another bogus analogy. How the hell do you "test" for FM reception?
- > It makes no sense.

Different modes require different equipment. I could, given a little time, come up with a valid test for both packet and FM voice that would if tested across the board improve operations and spectrum conservation. The latter being important to the Pro-Code-Testing group.

Now from your last paragraph, since one requires a reciever/tnc/modem for packet reception and you said "...a packet test by ear..." then can I safely assume that you get CW signals in your brain directly with out any type of reciever? Or are you argueing that CW can use equipment to recieve but not packet? And FM voice (IF you DO use a reciever) becomes very analogous(sp) to CW.

Arrrgh. This is red herring. Can you pass a packet test by ear (i.e., listening to the audio such as from a receiver) even given a receiver? I can pass an FM phone test given a receiver. So can anyone capable of understanding spoken English.

The only analogous tests are reading and aural comprehension. And, no, I don't need a receiver to copy code any more than a computer needs a receiver to copy data. (The one I'm typing on is exchanging data but has no receiver.) Receivers are useful for detecting radio signals, but you need one for any mode. Even packet. Of course, for packet, you \*must\* have a computer terminal, of some sort, too. That's the precise reason you don't have to understand it by ear.

I'm arguing that packet tests aren't necessary because the computer just tells you what it says. You don't copy it by ear. With code, you do. (Need I say again that computers I've used do a far worse job of copying code than I do, at least up to my code speed?) And unlike voice, we don't automatically learn it while growing up. Operating practice exams are a good but different idea: you're not supposed to have to know anything about them to pass the code test. You're only supposed to have to know code itself.

I didn't explain all this because I thought it would be clear. It was inspired of you to package receivers under the term "equipment." But, as you seem to me to have misunderstood once again the thrust of my argument in the part I deleted, perhaps the time has come to admit that we're not going to communicate on this issue?

-drt

--

-----  
|David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL

drt@mit.edu

|'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except  
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

-----  
Date: 18 Nov 93 14:42:57 GMT

From: butch!zuni.litc.lockheed.com!l03062@uunet.uu.net

Subject: This is a hobby not a

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

: > This statement s a strawman, since in actual fact there is \_not\_  
: >that much usage of Morse code, not in comparrison to the actuall  
: >number of transmission being made the world over.

BALONEY!! 57% of the HF operators isn't MUCH??

>Hell, packet radio  
: >quite nicely replaces Morse code, letting computers handle all the  
: >coding and decoding while the human simply reads and types.

Yeah!! If you wanna be human vegetable and not learn anything!! Let the Machine work for you!! MAYbe it'll be able to talk for you 100% too.. Why exert any effort.. Give me a break!!

: >Morse  
: >code IS obsolete. IE: As a needed mode. It is a nice mode to learn  
: >and play with though, but to make it a requirement for HF? Nah, you  
: >couldn't give me a decent reason to do so.

Well,

Like paul said in the previous post.. CW justifies itself.. And someone who has never operated it shouldn't base his conclusions on a lack of information.

73 De N0ELV  
(Mike)

-----  
Network Analyst | L03062@ZUNI.LITC.LOCKHEED.COM | EX- KA0MUG  
N0ELV@W0LJF.#NECO.CO.USA.NA

-----  
Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1993 15:18:44 -0700  
From: orca.es.com!cnn.sim.es.com!msanders.sim.es.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CGnIFp.612@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>, jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com  
(jeffrey.n.jones) wrote:

> With all the ranting and raving about Nocodes and what not here's  
> food for thought. What exactly has kept Amateur Radio from turning  
> into CB? Is it the written tests? The code tests? The self regulation?  
> There must be something. I believe it's the combination of the code  
> and the written tests. To pass both takes a fair amount of effort and  
> those that are the real bane of CB don't have enough on the ball to  
> study for the tests. CW has worked as a fairly good filter like it  
> or not. So have the written tests.

Jeff: I like the way you put your arguments. A definite filter is needed to keep those who would rather not put forth the effort out of the amateur bands. This has nothing to do with smarts, intelligence, or the like, but about attitude towards self and others. I like to think that "attitude" is what makes amateur service difference from the citizens band, and it is a citizens band for those who need some form of radio 2-way communication without any extra hassel of studying, testing, etc. My wife's folks can barely tune the VCR much less understand Ohm's law, but they have a need for some communication when up at their summer property with no phone service. It works for them. We have also used citizens band when driving with two cars in convoy, just to maintain communications. Now that I have two more hams in the family, that won't be necessary, but it still can conserve bandwidth for short range communications.

> However the days of CW tests are  
> coming to a close and it will be gone in the future. The written  
> tests will be made easier and easier so perhaps the lines between CB  
> and Amateur Radio will blurr. Any comments?

>

You may be right, but as long as there is a filter that requires some effort, the filter will always be effective against some of those with a "different" attitude. I do both code and SSB, my boys are nocode. Attitude and professional operation are what make the biggest difference.

>

> --

> Jeff Jones AB6MB |  
> jeffj@seeker.mystic.com | This Extra supports CW and the Nocode license!  
> Infolinc BBS 510-778-5929 |

--

=====  
Milt

Opinions, thoughts, &cetera are my own (when I can remember them).  
KB7MSF/AG  
Utah

-----

Date: Thu, 18 Nov 1993 17:25:40 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <7i36cc4w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,  
<1993Nov18.013440.13834@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,  
<DRT.93Nov18100838@alfredo.mit.edu>l.mu  
Subject : Re: Reprinted by popular demand

In <DRT.93Nov18100838@alfredo.mit.edu> drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

> There is SOMETHING. The biggest difference between CB and HAM is the  
> fact that hams ALWAYS use a call sign. It's damn near impossible for a  
> person to establish a conversation with another ham without a call sign  
> (if you want to talk to Robert, you must not have a "3" call). I hear  
> people using autopatches that don't give their calls, and it creates  
> quite a stir on the repeater.

>Any particular reason the control op on duty doesn't terminate the  
>illegal operation right away?

Indeed! I've heard numerous complaints in amateur.policy about the

state of the 2-meter repeaters on the east coast and in LA!

Whats the problem with the control operators and the repeater trustees over there? We always shut down the repeaters here in the Milwaukee area if prolonged and or repetitive violations occur! Get you act together. If things have degenerated to chaos, it's partly yout fault!

--

/`-_	kevin.jessup@mixcom.com		The US Constitution defines the
{	}/ Marquette Electronics, Inc		"rights" the people give to the
\	/ Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA		government, not the reverse!
__*	N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio		

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #466

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*